



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/742,281	12/22/2000	Samir Armando Salamah	839-892	8170

7590 07/23/2002

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.  
8th Floor  
1100 North Glebe Road  
Arlington, VA 22201

EXAMINER

CUEVAS, PEDRO J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 07/23/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/742,281

Applicant(s)

SALAMAH ET AL.

Examiner

Pedro J. Cuevas

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 17 April 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Drawings***

2. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on April 17, 2002 have been approved.
3. The corrected or substitute formal drawings were received on April 17, 2002. These drawings are acceptable.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,644,179 to Staub et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,553,722 to Cole.

Staub et al. discloses the construction of gas cooled end turns for dynamoelectric machine rotor, comprising:

a rotor (10) having a spindle and a body portion (12), a rotor winding having axially extending coils (20) and end turns (24) defining a plurality of concentric endwindings extending axially beyond at least one end of said body portion, said endwindings and said spindle defining an annular space therebetween; and

at least one, or a plurality of spaceblocks (32) located between adjacent said endwindings so as to define cavities (34), each bounded by adjacent spaceblocks and adjacent endwindings and open to said annular space; and each said spaceblock having:

first and second sidewalls engaging said adjacent endwindings,  
an upstream wall, and  
a downstream wall.

However, it fails to disclose a downstream wall of said spaceblock having a non-planar contour for reducing generated wake.

Cole teaches the construction of a variable-camber airfoil having a non-planar contour (Figures 2, 3 and 4) for the purpose of producing the desired aerodynamic curvature in the flexible upper skin.

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to use the variable-camber airfoil disclosed by Cole on the gas cooled end turns disclosed by Staub et al. for the purpose of producing the desired aerodynamic curvature in the flexible upper skin.

6. With regards to claims 2 and 10, Cole discloses a downstream wall having an aerodynamic contour to reduce the extent and strength of the generated wake.

7. With regards to claims 3, 6, 11 and 14, Cole discloses a downstream wall being defined as a generally parabolic curve.

8. With regards to claims 4, 7, 12 and 15, Staub et al. disclose an upstream wall, which is generally planar.

9. With regards to claims 5 and 13, Staub et al. disclose a spaceblock which is comprised of a generally rectangular main body portion (32) and a protrusion portion, said main body portion

Art Unit: 2834

defining said upstream wall and said sidewall portions, and said protrusion portions defining said downstream wall as shown in Figure 3.

10. With regards to claims 8 and 16, it must be noted that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to integrally form the re-entrant portion with the body portion, since it has been held that forming in one piece an article, which has formerly been formed in two pieces and put together, involves only routine skill in the art. *Howard v. Detroit Stove Works*, 150 U.S. 164 (1893). The term "integral" is sufficiently broad to embrace constructions united by such means as fastening and welding. *In re Hotte*, 177 USPQ 326, 328 (CCPA 1973).

### ***Conclusion***

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pedro J. Cuevas whose telephone number is (703) 308-4904. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 8:30 - 6:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor R. Ramírez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-1341 for regular communications and (703) 305-3432 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Application/Control Number: 09/742,281  
Art Unit: 2834

Page 5

Pedro J. Cuevas  
July 10, 2002



NESTOR RAMIREZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800